Write your name here Surname	Other n	ames
Pearson Edexcel GCE	Centre Number	Candidate Number
History Advanced Unit 3 Option E: War and Peace	:: Twentieth Century Int	ernational Relations
Friday 10 June 2016 – Morning Time: 2 hours		Paper Reference 6HI03/E
You must have: Source Insert (enclosed)		Total Marks

Instructions

- Use black ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- There are two sections in this question paper. Answer ONE Question from Section A and ONE Question from Section B on the topic for which you have been prepared.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided
 - there may be more space than you need.

Information

- The total mark for this paper is 70.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets
 - use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.
- The quality of your written communication will be assessed in all your responses
 - you should take particular care with your spelling, punctuation and grammar, as well as the clarity of expression.

Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ▶



SECTION A

Answer ONE question in Section A on the topic for which you have been prepared.

You should start the answer to your chosen question in Section A on page 3. Section B begins on page 11.

E1 – The World in Crisis, 1879–1941 Answer EITHER Question 1 OR Question 2.

EITHER

1 'From 1879–1914 the European alliance systems served only to destabilise relations between the great powers.'

How far do you agree with this view?

(Total for Question 1 = 30 marks)

OR

2 'The peace treaties of 1919–23 largely ignored President Wilson's 14 Points.'

How far do you agree with this view?

(Total for Question 2 = 30 marks)

E2 - A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944-90

Answer EITHER Question 3 OR Question 4.

EITHER

3 'The Soviet Union was seriously committed to peaceful coexistence with the US in the years 1954–62.'

How far do you agree with this view?

(Total for Question 3 = 30 marks)

OR

4 Why did Sino-Soviet relations change so dramatically from alliance to confrontation during the 1960s?

(Total for Question 4 = 30 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 30 MARKS



SECTION A				
Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box \boxtimes . If you change your mind, put a line through the box \boxtimes and then indicate your new question with a cross \boxtimes .				
Chosen question number:	Question 1	\boxtimes	Question 2	\boxtimes
	Question 3	\boxtimes	Question 4	



(Section A continued)	

(Section A continued)



(Section A continued)	





(Section A continued)	





(Section A continued)	
TOTAL FOI	SECTION A - 20 MARKS



SECTION B

Answer ONE question in Section B on the topic for which you have been prepared

You should start the answer to your chosen question in Section B on page 13.

E1 - The World in Crisis, 1879-1941

Study the relevant sources in the Sources Insert. Answer EITHER Question 5 OR Question 6.

EITHER

5 Use Sources 1, 2 and 3 and your own knowledge.

How far do you agree that the League of Nations failed in the inter-war period because it needed 'a better quality of Great Power commitment than was forthcoming'? (Source 1 Line 12–13)

Explain your answer, using Sources 1, 2 and 3 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 5 = 40 marks)

OR

6 Use Sources 4, 5 and 6 and your own knowledge.

'Hitler's decision to invade the Soviet Union in June 1941 was based purely on ideological considerations.'

How far do you agree with this view?

Explain your answer, using Sources 4, 5 and 6 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 6 = 40 marks)



E2 – A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944–90

Study the relevant sources in the Sources Insert. Answer EITHER Question 7 OR Question 8.

EITHER

7 Use Sources 7, 8 and 9 and your own knowledge.

'The actions of President Truman of the USA were primarily responsible for the development of the Cold War in the years 1945–50.'

How far do you agree with this view?

Explain your answer, using Sources 7, 8 and 9 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 7 = 40 marks)

OR

8 Use Sources 10, 11 and 12 and your own knowledge.

How far do you agree with the view that the Cold War came to an end in the late 1980s because 'dissatisfaction with dictatorship erupted all through the Soviet bloc'? (Source 10 Line 1–2)

Explain your answer, using Sources 10, 11 and 12 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 8 = 40 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 40 MARKS



SECTION B				
Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box \boxtimes . If you change your mind, put a line through the box \boxtimes and then indicate your new question with a cross \boxtimes .				
Chosen question number:	Question 5		Question 6	\boxtimes
	Question 7	\boxtimes	Question 8	



(Section B continued)	

(Section B continued)



(Section B continued)	

(Section B continued)	



(Section B continued)

(Section B continued)



(Section B continued)	
	,

(Section B continued)	



ection B continued)	

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 40 MARKS
TOTAL FOR PAPER = 70 MARKS



BLANK PAGE



BLANK PAGE

Pearson Edexcel GCE

History

Advanced Unit 3

Option E: War and Peace: Twentieth Century International Relations

Friday 10 June 2016 - Morning

Sources Insert - Section B

Paper Reference

6HI03/E

Do not return the insert with the question paper.

Turn over ▶





Sources for use with Section B. Answer ONE question in Section B on the topic for which you have been prepared.

E1 - The World in Crisis, 1879-1941

Sources for use with Question 5

SOURCE 1

(From Martyn Housden, *The League of Nations and the Organisation of Peace*, published 2012)

It is easy to maintain that, in the end, the League and collective security failed. Collective security was not properly applied when it most needed to be - over Manchuria, when sanctions were not considered seriously, and over Italy, when they were implemented half-heartedly. Collective security was also let down badly by the very states which should have been leading it most enthusiastically. After all, a system is only as good as the elements comprising it. Thus, it was lamentable that two Council members (Japan and Italy) embarked on international aggression in clear contravention of the Covenant. Moreover, centrally important states, such as Britain and France, failed to live up fully to their League obligations. Too often, they seemed willing to respect international obligations only insofar as their narrow national interests dictated. To have prevented war, the League would have required a better quality of Great Power commitment than was forthcoming.

SOURCE 2

(From J.M. Roberts, Europe 1880–1945, published 1970)

There were important shortcomings in the form of the League. Russia and
Germany were not part of it, Russia consistently decrying it, and the Germans
sulking self-righteously because they were excluded by Wilson and Clemenceau.
This added to the stigma the League possessed in German eyes as part of an imposed peace. But the most serious defect of the League was the absence of the
United States. The decisive vote in the US Senate was taken in November 1919 and although President Wilson did not at once give up hope, this was in fact the end of
American participation. The results of this withdrawal of the United States from an organisation which might have transformed European affairs are incalculable.

SOURCE 3

(From Ruth Henig, *The League of Nations*, published 2010)

The League was hampered by three major difficulties. Firstly, it had to operate in an unstable international environment which generated a level of political and economic turbulence that was bound to undermine the League's effectiveness.

Secondly, in the absence of the USA and of Russia, it was driven by two Great Powers, Britain and France, whose world influence and global reach was on the wane, and who were fatally divided in their views on how the League could most effectively maintain international peace. And thirdly, the First World War had fatally weakened the economic strength and political dominance of its European combatants, and had accelerated a decisive shift of world power. The League was conceived as a world-wide organisation, but its engine was in practice powered from Europe, and it was not strong enough to promote peace across the globe.

E1 - The World in Crisis, 1879-1941

Sources for use with Question 6

SOURCE 4

(From Martyn Whittock, *The Third Reich: The Rise and Fall of the Nazis*, published 2011)

On 22 June 1941, Germany and its allies attacked the USSR in Operation Barbarossa. Over 3 million troops of Germany and its allies invaded the USSR along a 1,800-mile (2,900-kilometre) front. For the Nazis, it was the culmination of their geo-political dreams. Here, at last, was the opportunity to capture vast areas for Lebensraum in the East and to seize the resources of the USSR. More than this, it saw the realisation of the Nazi racial and political fantasies that had fused Jews and communists as their ultimate enemies and that regarded the USSR as the home of 'Jewish-Bolshevism'. Nothing resonated with Hitler's psyche and Nazi political ideology as much as the war in the East.

SOURCE 5

(From Richard Overy, *The Dictators: Hitler's Germany*, Stalin's Russia, published 2005)

Some of the arguments that Hitler elaborated to justify the war against the Soviet Union were products of circumstance. In July 1940, he made it clear that invasion was a way of securing complete mastery of Europe as a springboard for the war against the British Empire, and perhaps the United States. War would also end the uncertainty and speculation about Stalin's motives as the communist frontier crept stealthily closer to central Europe. Hitler also understood that Soviet raw materials, oil and foodstuffs could relieve the German war economy in any future contest with the resource-rich West. Behind all the expressions of rational strategic necessity, however, lurked the more fantastic ambitions to complete the national revolutionary war waged since 1933 against communism and its alleged Jewish allies, and to free up the limitless geography of the east for a permanent German Empire.

SOURCE 6

(From Robert Gellately, Lenin, Stalin and Hitler: The Age of Social Catastrophe, published 2008)

Hitler was determined to take on Stalin before, or as part of, defeating the British, even though such an attack went against one of his key principles – namely the need to avoid a two-front war. He was convinced the British were staying in the war in the belief that the Soviets and perhaps the United States would come in on their side. The German attack would not only crush the home of 'Jewish Bolshevism', as Hitler had long hoped, but hasten peace with Britain. Defeating Stalin would also relieve Japanese worries about Soviet encroachments, and would free up Japan to explore options elsewhere, making it likely the United States would have to become involved to check the Japanese. That would draw the attention of the United States away from Europe and continue to give Hitler a free hand there.

35

40

Sources for use with Section B. Answer ONE question in Section B on the topic for which you have been prepared.

E2 – A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944–90

Sources for use with Question 7

SOURCE 7

(From Robert H. Ferrell, Harry S. Truman: A Life, published 1994)

Truman did not always do the right thing in the Cold War. In the Truman Doctrine (1947), he overstated the need to oppose the Soviet Union to get a large appropriation for Greece and Turkey through Congress. He also persuaded some Americans to consider the USSR as a bogeyman rather than another, if large and important, opponent of the United States. Such exaggeration led to the belief that the United States committed itself to oppose communism everywhere. When considering the Marshall Plan, Truman may have overestimated the impact of its assistance to European stability. In the case of the North Atlantic Treaty, the Truman administration misjudged the intentions of the USSR, sensing a Soviet desire to conquer Western Europe.

SOURCE 8

(From Thomas G. Paterson, *On Every Front: The Making of the Cold War*, published 1979)

After 1945, the major powers intervened abroad to exploit the political opportunities created by the destructive impact of World War II. The stakes seemed high. A change in a nation's political orientation might lead to a change in its international alignment. Americans feared that a leftist or communist Greece would look to the USSR and permit menacing Soviet bases on Greek

15 territory or open the door to a Soviet naval presence in the Mediterranean.

The Russians dreaded a conservative anti-Soviet Polish government led by the London faction, for it might prove so weak and so hostile to Moscow as to permit a revived Germany to send storm troopers once again through Poland and into the heart of Russia. Such considerations drew the major powers into competition.

SOURCE 9

(From Vladislav Zubok and Constantine Pleshakov, 'The Soviet Union' in David Reynolds (ed.), *The Origins of the Cold War in Europe: International Perspectives*, published 1994)

Was the Cold War the result of misperceptions or was it a conflict of vital interests? On the Soviet side it was both. Stalin's misperceptions played a vastly greater role than anti-Soviet moods in Washington or London, because Stalin's control over Soviet foreign policy was total. His conclusion in 1947 that a global struggle now existed between Moscow and the West made the Cold War inevitable. At the same time, Soviet ideological interests were at stake in Germany and elsewhere. These ideological interests prevailed over Stalin's more realistic side – first in Germany, where the Soviets supported a rootless puppet government instead of building long-term Soviet-German friendship; second, in Korea, by supporting Kim II Sung's invasion of the South.

30

25

5

10

E2 – A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944–90

Sources for use with Question 8

SOURCE 10

(From Howard Zinn, A People's History of the United States, published 2005)

In the year 1989, the long suppressed dissatisfaction with dictatorship erupted all through the Soviet bloc. There were mass demonstrations in the countries of Eastern Europe, long dominated by the USSR. The wall separating East Berlin from West Berlin, long a symbol of the tight control exerted by East Germany over its population, was dismantled in the presence of wildly excited citizens of both Germanies. In Czechoslovakia, a new non-communist government came into being, headed by a former imprisoned dissident. In Poland, Bulgaria and Hungary, new leaderships emerged promising freedom and democracy. Remarkably, all this took place without a civil war and in response to overwhelming popular demand. In the United States, Republicans claimed that Reagan's hard-line policies and the increase in military expenditure had brought down the Soviet Union.

SOURCE 11

(From Walter LaFeber, America, Russia and the Cold War 1945–1992, published 1993)

Until the mid-1970s, Brezhnev had built up his military by spending as much as 15 per cent of GNP on it (Americans spent about 6 per cent of a much larger GNP). Brezhnev did so at the expense of investment and the civilian sectors. 45 A corrupt disheartening stagnation set in. The economy's growth rate came close to zero per cent. As the world's largest oil producer and dependent on petroleum exports for 60 per cent of its badly needed hard currency earnings, the Soviets suffered severely as their production levelled off and world oil prices skidded downward in the 1980s. The Soviet bloc was linked economically by 50 USSR shipments of raw materials (especially oil) to satellites such as Poland and Czechoslovakia, who sent the Soviets increasingly inferior manufactured goods. As oil prices sank and the quality of manufactured goods worsened, the trade links frayed. Even militarily, Warsaw Pact relations soured because the Soviets could not modernise their allies' forces. 55

SOURCE 12

(From Jeremy Isaacs and Taylor Downing, *Cold War*, published 2008)

In 1992, George Bush claimed triumphantly that the United States had 'won the Cold War'. Gorbachev preferred to believe it was 'our common victory'. Certainly, at the Cold War's end, the United States remained the world's one great power and the Soviet Union had ceased to exist. But the United States did not achieve this end simply by facing down its enemy. It was Gorbachev who made the moves in ending the arms race. He surrendered Communist rule in Eastern Europe and, however gradually, he introduced multi-party rule in the USSR itself. He played a major role in the ending of the Cold War and particularly in the manner of its ending.

5





